REMARKS

Applicants have amended the two paragraphs beginning at page 1, line 21 and page 2, line 5, to disclose:

> A stock solution as a chemical and a propellant for pressurizing the container interior are placed in a mixed state into each of those containers. The stock solution and the propellant are ejected in a mixed state. Therefore, when the stock solution alone is to be used, there is used a container of a double structure using a piston or the like. This technique is disclosed, for example, at page 2, right column, line 1, to page 3, left column, line 39, and Figs. 1 and 2, of:
>
> Japanese Patent Publication No. Hei 5 (1993)-20148 (which corresponds to Japanese Laid-open Patent Publication No. 63-190669).

In view of the current amendment to the Specification, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the Specification, as set forth on page 2 of the Office Action mailed September 10, 2010, is moot. Applicants respectfully submit that Japanese Laid-open Patent Publication No. 63-190669 was submitted in an Information Disclosure Statement in the subject application on July 20, 2006.

Applicants have amended their Claims in order to further clarify the definition of various aspects of the present invention. Specifically, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell, comprising: a liquid fuel chamber having a space configured for the storage of liquid fuel; a valve disposed in an outlet of the liquid fuel chamber, the valve configured to supply the liquid fuel from the space to the fuel cell or stop the supply of the fuel; a partition wall member movable through the space toward the valve; and a compressed gas chamber communicating with the space and storing compressed gas, the compressed gas imparting a back pressure to the partition wall member so that the partition wall member moves through the space toward the valve, the liquid fuel chamber and the compressed gas chamber being integral with each other, wherein a face of the partition wall member

opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom." For example, support may be found for the current amendment to Claim 1 in, e.g., Figs. 1(b), 7(b), and 10(b), and in the Specification at page 4, lines 3-5; page 9, lines 1-6; page 20, line 17 through page 21, line 3.

Applicants have amended Claim 3, to recite "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell comprising: a container body storing liquid fuel and compressed gas, the container body having a connection port configured to supply the liquid fuel to the fuel cell; a partition wall member disposed within the container body, the partition wall member partitioning the interior of the container body into a liquid fuel chamber storing the liquid fuel and a compressed gas chamber being juxtaposed to each other, and the compressed gas chamber being contiguous to the liquid fuel chamber and with the compressed gas sealed therein; and a valve disposed in the connection port, wherein a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port by the action of the back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom." For example, support for the amendment to Claim 3 may be found in the Specification at page 9, line 1 through page 10, line 1; and page 20, line 17 through page 21, line 3.

Applicants have cancelled Claims 6 and 7 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants have added new Claim 13, which recites "[a] fuel container according to claim 1, wherein a stopper that prevents a contact between the partition

wall member and a bottom wall member of the container is formed on the bottom wall member." For example, support for new Claim 13 may be found in the Specification at found in the Specification at page 13, line 22 through page 14, line 5.

Applicants have added new Claim 14, which recites "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 1, wherein the compressed gas chamber surrounds the liquid fuel container." For example, support for new Claim 14 may be found in the Specification at page 22, lines 1-7.

Applicants have added new Claim 15, which recites "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 1, wherein the compressed gas chamber and the liquid fuel container are arranged on the same axis of thereof." For example, support for new Claim 15 may be found in the Specification at page 22, lines 1-7; and page 24, lines 12-15.

Applicants have added new Claim 16, which recites "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 1, wherein the valve is fitted in a connection port formed in the outlet of the liquid fuel chamber, the valve having a spacer disposed on a peripheral wall of a bottom of the connection port, a spring supported within the spacer, a gasket disposed over the spacer, a hollow valve stem having a communication hole, the valve stem being inserted within the gasket, a fixing member engaged with an inner wall of the connection port and configured to urge the valve stem against the spring to allow communication between an liquid fuel chamber and the fuel cell." For example, support for new Claim 16 may be found in the Specification at page 9, lines 4-5; and page 14, line 8 through page 15, line 10.

Applicants have added new Claim 17, which recites "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 1, wherein an outer periphery of the partition wall member is in airtight contact with an inner wall of the space, and an entire surface of the face

of the partition wall is configured to conform against an entire surface of the end face of the space adjacent the outlet." For example, support for new Claim 17 may be found in the Specification at page 16, lines 3-8; page 19, lines 4-9; page 20, line 22 through page 21, line 3; and Figs. 1(b), 7(b) and 10(b).

Applicants have added new Claim 18, which recites "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 17, wherein the liquid fuel chamber is filled with the liquid fuel." For example, support for new Claim 18 may be found in the Specification at page 16, lines 5-8.

Applicants have added new Claim 19, which recites "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 1, wherein the liquid fuel chamber is filled with the liquid fuel." For example, support for new Claim 19 may be found in the Specification at page 16, lines 5-8.

Applicants have added new Claim 20, which recites "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 3, wherein an outer periphery of the partition wall member is in airtight contact with an inner wall of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body, and an entire surface of the face of the partition wall is configured to conform against an entire surface of the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port." For example, support for new Claim 20 may be found in the Specification at page 16, lines 3-8; page 19, lines 4-9; page 20, line 22 through page 21, line 3; and Figs. 1(b), 7(b) and 10(b).

Applicants have added new Claim 21, which recites "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 20, wherein the liquid fuel chamber is filled with the liquid fuel." For example, support for new Claim 21 may be found in the Specification at page 16, lines 5-8.

Applicants have added new Claim 22, which recites "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 3, wherein the liquid fuel chamber is filled with the liquid fuel." For example, support for new Claim 22 may be found in the Specification at page 16, lines 5-8.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the Claims presented for consideration by the Examiner patentably distinguish over the teachings of the references applied by the Examiner in rejecting Claims in the Office Action mailed September 10, 2010, that is, the teachings of the U.S. Patent No. 4,108,219 to Shulsinger (hereinafter Shulsinger), U.S. Patent No. 5,423,454 to Lippman et al. (hereinafter Lippman), U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0019888 to Gupta (hereinafter Gupta), Japan Patent Application No. 60-86744 (hereinafter '744), and U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0082421 to Yonetsu et al. (hereinafter Yonetsu) under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the rejections of Claims 6 and 7 as set forth in the Office Action mailed September 10, 2010, are moot in light of the cancellation of Claims 6 and 7.

Applicants respectfully traverse the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejections of Claims 1-4, 9, and 12 of the subject application over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No: 7,766,032 (hereinafter '032), as set forth on page 3 of the Office Action mailed September 10, 2010; Claim 5 of the subject application over claim 1 of '032 in view of Shulsinger, as set forth on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action; Claim 8 of the subject application over claim 1 of '032 in view of Lippman, as set forth on page 4 of the Office Action; and Claims 10 and 11 of the subject application over claims 1 and 8 of '032, as set forth on pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action. As will be shown in the following, it is respectfully submitted that the subject

matter claimed in '032, and/or disclosed in Shulsinger or Lippman, would not have recited, disclosed, or rendered obvious the recitations in the present claims.

"A non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim." See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); and *In re Longi*, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985)(emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1 and 3 of the subject application on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of '032, because claims 1 and 2 of '032 do not recite or render obvious, at least, "a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space against the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom," as recited in Claim 1 of subject application; or "a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port by the action of the back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom," as recited in Claim 3 of subject application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 1 and 3 of the subject application over claims 1 and 2 of '032 is improper.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 2, 4, 9 and 12 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of '032, because Claims 2 and 4 depend on Claim 1 of the subject application, and Claims 9 and 12 depend on any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. As noted above, the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 1 and 3 of the subject application over claims 1 and 2 of '032 is improper. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 2, 4, 9 and 12 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of '032 is improper, because Claims 2, 4, 9 and 12 refer back to and incorporate the recitations of Claims 1 and/or 3 of the subject application, and the additional recitations of Claims 2, 4, 9 and 12 must be read as a whole with the recitations of Claims 1 and/or 3 of the subject application.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 5 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of '032 in view of Shulsinger, for the reasons noted below. Claim 5 of the subject application recites "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell according to any of claims 1 to 3, wherein the container body is formed in the shape of a cylinder, the liquid fuel chamber is formed in the shape of a cylinder or in a tubular shape having an oblong section."

In light of the fact that Claim 5 depends on any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 of '032 would not have recited

or rendered obvious a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, as recited in Claim 1 of the subject application; or a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port by the action of the back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, as recited in Claim 3 of the subject application. Claim 2 of the subject application depends on Claim 1 of the subject application. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, Claim 2 refers back to and incorporates the recitations of Claim 1, and the additional recitations of Claim 2 must be read as a whole with the recitations of Claim 1. In light of the above noted facts, Applicants respectfully submit that that claim 1 of '032 would not have recited or rendered obvious the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3. Shulsinger would have disclosed a can for spraying atomized liquids. Shulsinger, abstract. Shulsinger would have also disclosed that continued actuation of the aerosol valve 17 will cause the piston 23 to move up within the cylinder 21 until it contacts the valve to completely pressurize the volume 29 and substantially evacuate and collapsed the volume 31. Shulsinger col. 5, lines 2-7; and Fig. 1. Applicants respectfully submit that that Shulsinger would not have remedied the deficiencies of claim 1 of '032 with respect to a rejection of any of Claims 1 to 3 of

the subject application, because Shulsinger discloses a can for spraying atomized liquids, not "a fuel container for a fuel cell ...configured to supply the liquid fuel," as recited in any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit Shulsinger would not have remedied the deficiencies of claim 1 of '032 with respect to a rejection of any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application, because Shulsinger would have disclosed that the piston contacts the valve, not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet, as recited in Claim 1, on which Claim 2 depends; and not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port, as recited in Claim 3 of the subject application. Therefore, in light of the above-noted facts, Applicants respectfully submit that a rejection of any of Claims 1 to 3 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of '032 in view of Shulsinger would be improper, because a combination of claim 1 of '032 and Shulsinger would not have recited, disclosed, or rendered obvious the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 5 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of '032 in view of Shulsinger is improper, because Claim 5 depends on any of Claims 1 to 3, and a non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application based on claim 1 of '032 in view of Shulsinger would be improper, as noted above. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the

additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claim 5 is improper, because Claim 5 refers back to and incorporates the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3; and the additional recitations of Claim 5 must be read as a whole with the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 8 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of '032 in view of Lippman, for the reasons noted below. Claim 8 of the subject application recites "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell according to any of claims 1 to 3, wherein the maximum pressure of the compressed gas is 0.3 MPaG or lower."

In light of the fact that Claim 8 depends on any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application, Applicants again respectfully submit that claim 1 of '032 would not have recited or rendered obvious the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application, for the reasons noted above. Lippman would have disclosed a method for the generation of a propellant gas, for dispensing products, e.g., aerosols, by electrochemical means through the electrolysis of a chemical mixture. Lippman, col. 4, lines 63-66. Lippman would have disclosed a gas pressure for aerosol applications of between 10 to 40 psi. Lippman, col. 5, lines 60-62. Lippman would have also disclosed a container having movable wall or polyethylene piston. Lippman, col. 11, lines 33-36. Applicants respectfully submit that that Lippman would not have remedied the deficiencies of claim 1 of '032 with respect to a rejection of any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application, because Lippman discloses a method for the generation of a propellant gas, for dispensing products, e.g., aerosols, by electrochemical means through the electrolysis of a chemical

mixture, not "a fuel container for a fuel cell, ...configured to supply the liquid fuel," as recited in any of Claim 1 to 3 of the subject application. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit Lippman would not have remedied the deficiencies of claim 1 of '032 with respect to a rejection of any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application, because Lippman would not have disclosed or rendered obvious a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet, as recited in Claim 1, on which Claim 2 depends; or a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port, as recited in Claim 3 of the subject application. Therefore, in light of the above-noted facts, Applicants respectfully submit that the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3 would not have been disclosed or rendered obvious by a combination of claim 1 of '032 and Lippman. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that rejections of any of Claims 1 to 3 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of '032 in view of Lippman would be improper.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 8 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of '032 in view of Lippman is improper, because Claim 8 depends on any of Claims 1 to 3, and a non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application based on claim 1 of '032 in view of Lippman would be improper, as noted above. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the

recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claim 8 is improper, because Claim 8 refers back to and incorporates the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3; and the additional recitations of Claim 8 must be read as a whole with the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 10 and 11 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 8 of '032, for the reasons noted below. Claim 10 of the subject application recites "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell according to any of claims 1 to 3, wherein at least a part of the liquid fuel chamber is formed of a light transmitting material." Claim 11 of the subject application recites "[a] fuel container for a fuel cell according to any of claims 1 to 3, wherein the container body has scales indicating the position of the partition wall member."

In light of the fact that Claims 10 and 11 depend on any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application, Applicants respectfully submit that that claim 1 of '032 would not have recited or rendered obvious the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application, for the reasons noted above. Claim 8 of '032 recites the container body has a transparent window through which a position of the partition wall member and a residual quantity of the liquid fuel in the fuel chamber may be visually checked. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 of '032 would not have remedied the deficiencies of claim 1 of '032 with respect to a rejection of and of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application, because a combination of claim 1 and claim 8 of '032 would not have recited or rendered obvious a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet, as recited in Claim 1, on which Claim 2

depends; or a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port, as recited in Claim 3 of the subject application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that rejections of any of Claims 1 to 3 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 8 of '032 would be improper.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 10 and 11 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 8 of '032 is improper, because Claims 10 and 11 depend on any of Claims 1 to 3, and a non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of any of Claims 1 to 3 of the subject application based on claims 1 and 8 of '032 would be improper, as noted above. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 10 and 11 is improper, because Claims 10 and 11 refer back to and incorporate the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3; and the additional recitations of Claims 10 and 11 must be read as a whole with the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-7 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Shulsinger, Applicants respectfully submit that "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987); *Manual of Patent*

Examining Procedure (MPEP) §2131, Eighth Edition August 2001, Latest Revision July 2010.

Shulsinger discloses a can for spraying atomized liquids. Shulsinger, abstract. Shulsinger also discloses that continued actuation of the aerosol valve 17 will cause the piston 23 to move up within the cylinder 21 until it contacts the valve to completely pressurize the volume 29 and substantially evacuate and collapsed the volume 31. Shulsinger col. 5, lines 2-7; and Fig. 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that Shulsinger does not anticipate Claims 1 and 3 under 35 USC §102(b) because Shulsinger discloses a can for spraying atomized liquids, "not a fuel container for a fuel cell, ...configured to supply the liquid fuel," as recited in Claims 1 and 3. In addition, Shulsinger does not disclose a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet, as recited in Claim 1; because Shulsinger discloses that the piston contacts the valve, not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the top face of the space. Moreover Shulsinger does not disclose a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port, as recited in Claim 3, because Shulsinger discloses that the piston contacts the valve, not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Shulsinger does not anticipate Claims

1 and 3, because Shulsinger does not disclose each and every element as set forth in Claims 1 and 3.

Applicants respectfully submit that that Shulsinger does not anticipate Claims 2 and 4-7, because Claims 2 and 4 depend on Claim 1, and Claims 5-7 depend on any of Claims 1 to 3. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2 and 4-7 are not anticipated by Shulsinger, and the additional recitations of Claims 2 and 4-7 are not anticipated by Shulsinger.

In response to the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shulsinger in view of Lippman, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teachings of Shulsinger and Lippman would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 8, for the reasons noted below.

Claim 8 recites a fuel container for a fuel cell according to any of claims 1 to 3, wherein the maximum pressure of the compressed gas is 0.3 MPaG or lower. Shulsinger would have disclosed a can for spraying atomized liquids comprising a pair of coaxial cylinders. Shulsinger, abstract. Shulsinger would have also disclosed that continued actuation of the aerosol valve 17 will cause the piston 23 to move up within the cylinder 21 until it contacts the valve to completely pressurize the volume 29 and substantially evacuate and collapsed the volume 31. Shulsinger col. 5, lines 2-7; and Fig. 1. Lippman would have disclosed a method for the generation of a propellant gas, for dispensing products, e.g., aerosols, by electrochemical means through the electrolysis of a chemical mixture. Lippman, col. 4, lines 63-66. Lippman would have also disclosed a gas pressure for aerosol applications of

between 10 to 40 psi. Lippman, col. 5, lines 60-62. Lippman would have also disclosed a container having movable wall or polyethylene piston. Lippman, col. 11, lines 33-36.

Applicants respectfully submit that that a combination of Shulsinger and Lippman would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 8, because a combination of Shulsinger and Lippman would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3, upon which Claim 8 depends. Applicants respectfully submit that that a combination of Shulsinger and Lippman would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claims 1 and 3, because Shulsinger would have disclosed a can for spraying atomized liquids, and Lippman would have disclosed a method for the generation of a propellant gas, for dispensing products, e.g., aerosols, by electrochemical means through the electrolysis of a chemical mixture, and neither Shulsinger nor Lippman would have disclosed or rendered obvious a fuel container for a fuel cell, ...configured to supply the liquid fuel, as recited in Claims 1 and 3. As noted above, the additional recitations of Claim 2 must be read as a whole with Claim 1 because Claim 2 depends on Claim 1. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that that any of Claims 1 to 3 would not have been obvious over the combined disclosures Shulsinger and Lippman.

Moreover, the recitations of Claim 1, on which Claim 2 depends, include, inter alia, a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom. The recitations of Claim 3 include, inter alia, a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the

liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port by the action of the back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom. Shulsinger would have disclosed that the piston contacts the valve, not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet, as recited in Claim 1, on which Claim 2 depends. Moreover, Shulsinger would have disclosed that the piston contacts the valve, not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port, as recited in Claim 3. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Shulsinger would not have disclosed the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3. Applicants respectfully submit that Lippman would not have remedied the deficiencies of Shulsinger, because Lippman would have disclosed a container having a movable wall or polyethylene piston, not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, as in Claim 1, on which Claim 2 depends. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Lippman would not have remedied the deficiencies of Shulsinger, because Lippman would have disclosed a container having a movable wall or polyethylene piston, not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with

the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port by the action of the back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, as in Claim 3. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that that Lippman would not have remedied the deficiencies of Shulsinger with respect to the rejection of any of Claims 1 to 3. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that that any of Claims 1 to 3 would not have been obvious over the combined disclosures of Shulsinger and Lippman.

As noted above, Claim 8 depends on any of Claims 1 to 3. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 8 would not have been obvious over a combination of Shulsinger and Lippman, and the additional recitations of Claim 8 would not have been obvious over Shulsinger and Lippman.

In response to the rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shulsinger in view of Gupta, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teachings of Shulsinger and Gupta would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 9, for the reasons noted below.

Claim 9 recites a fuel container for a fuel cell according to any of claims 1 to 3, wherein the compressed gas is an oxygen-free gas. As noted above, Shulsinger would have disclosed a can for spraying atomized liquids comprising a pair of coaxial cylinders, wherein continued actuation of the aerosol valve 17 will cause the piston 23 to move up within the cylinder 21 until it contacts the valve to completely pressurize the volume 29 and substantially evacuate and collapsed the volume 31.

Shulsinger would have disclosed that propulsion force may be generated by a gas, preferably air, under pressure. Shulsinger, col. 2, lines 27-29. Gupta would have disclosed a piston for a pressurized container (i.e., "aerosol can"), the piston including a body having circumferential fins, with the fins being of uniform thickness, decreasing thickness radially away from the body, or varying thickness circumferentially. Gupta, abstract. Gupta would have also disclosed propellant such as isobutane, n-butane, propane, dimethyloxide, fluorocarbons, compressed air, nitrogen, and carbon dioxide. Gupta, paragraph [0098]. Gupta would have also disclosed the main body of piston 200 includes an upper portion 202 which is generally shaped to be received into the inner top surface of container 100 so that product dispersion is not limited by cap 104 prematurely restricting the upper extent of travel of piston 200. Gupta, paragraph [0055]. Gupta would have also disclosed that the upper portion 202 may also include a concave portion 203 to avoid impinging on any portion of valve system 112 that extends into the top portion of container 100. Gupta, paragraph [0055], and Figs. 1A and 6. Gupta would have also disclosed that the upper portion 202 is shaped not only to be received into, but to conform to the inner top surface of the container. Gupta, paragraph [0055].

Applicants respectfully submit that that Shulsinger in view of Gupta would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 9, which include a fuel container for a fuel cell according to any of claims 1 to 3, wherein the compressed gas is an oxygen-free gas, because, as noted on page 7 of the Office Action mailed, September 10, 2010, Shulsinger would not have disclosed that the compressed gas is an oxygen-free gas. In fact, Applicants respectfully submit that that Shulsinger would have taught away from the compressed gas is an oxygen-free gas, as recited in Claim 9, because Shulsinger would have disclosed that propulsion force may be

generated by a gas, preferably air, under pressure, and air contains oxygen. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Gupta would have taught away from an oxygen-free gas, because Gupta would have disclosed a propellant of compressed air, which contains oxygen.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that a combination of Shulsinger and Gupta would not have disclosed or rendered obvious a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet, as recited in Claim 1 on which Claim 2 depends; and a combination of Shulsinger and Gupta would not have disclosed or rendered obvious an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port as recited in Claim 3; and therefore a combination of Shulsinger and Gupta would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3, on which Claim 9 depends, for the reasons noted below. Shulsinger would have disclosed that the piston contacts the valve, not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet, as recited in Claim 1, on which Claim 2 depends; and not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port, as recited in Claim 3. Applicants respectfully submit that Gupta would not have remedied the deficiencies of Shulsinger, because Gupta would have disclosed that an upper portion of the piston has a concave portion, having an upper periphery (Gupta, Figs. 1A and 6), which is

not a face of the partition wall member, as recited in any of Claims 1 to 3. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that any of Claims 1 to 3 would not have been obvious over a combination of Shulsinger and Gupta. As noted above, Claim 9 depends on any of Claims 1 to 3. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 9 would not have been obvious over a combination of Shulsinger and Gupta, and the additional recitations of Claim 9 would not have been obvious over a combination of Shulsinger and Gupta.

In response to the rejection of Claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shulsinger in view of '744, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teachings of Shulsinger and '744 would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claims 10 and 11, for the reasons noted below.

Claim 10 recites a fuel container for a fuel cell according to any of claims 1 to 3, wherein at least a part of the liquid fuel chamber is formed of a light transmitting material. Claim 11 recites a fuel container for a fuel cell according to any of claims 1 to 3, wherein the container body has scales indicating the position of the partition wall member. As noted above, Shulsinger would have disclosed a can for spraying atomized liquids comprising a pair of coaxial cylinders, wherein continued actuation of the aerosol valve 17 will cause the piston 23 to move up within the cylinder 21 until it contacts the valve to completely pressurize the volume 29 and substantially evacuate and collapsed the volume 31. The '744 reference would have disclosed a cartridge tank for a fuel oil burner having a measuring window of a direct transparent

view type, wherein the window has a pair of scales each of which has an opposite direction. '744, Claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that that a combination of Shulsinger and '744 would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claims 10 and 11, because Shulsinger and the '744 reference would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3, upon which Claims 10 and 11 depend. As noted above, the recitations of Claim 1, on which Claim 2 depends, includes, inter alia, a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom; and the recitations of Claim 3, include, inter alia, a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port by the action of the back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom. Shulsinger discloses that the piston contacts the valve, not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet, as recited in Claim 1, on which Claim 2 depends; and not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port, as recited in Claim 3. Moreover, the '744 reference would not have remedied the deficiencies of Shulsinger. For the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully

submit that any of Claims 1 to 3 would not have been obvious over a combination of Shulsinger and the '744 reference.

As noted above, Claims 10 and 11 depend on any of Claims 1 to 3. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 10 and 11 would not have been obvious over a combination of Shulsinger and '744, and the additional recitations of Claims 10 and 11 would not have been obvious over a combination Shulsinger and '744.

In response to the rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shulsinger in view of Yonetsu, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teachings of Shulsinger and Yonetsu would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 12, for the reasons noted below.

Claim 12 recites a fuel container for a fuel cell according to any of claims 1 to 3, wherein the liquid fuel is a mixture of methanol and water. As noted above, Shulsinger would have disclosed a can for spraying atomized liquids comprising a pair of coaxial cylinders, wherein continued actuation of the aerosol valve 17 will cause the piston 23 to move up within the cylinder 21 until it contacts the valve to completely pressurize the volume 29 and substantially evacuate and collapsed the volume 31. Yonetsu would have disclosed a mixture of methanol and water is used as the fuel for the fuel cell. Yonetsu, paragraph [0006]. Yonetsu would have also disclosed a liquid fuel tank where liquid fuel within the tank is kept pushed to the liquid fuel outlet section by a pressurizing mechanism, such as a sealing part pushed

by a spring, so that liquid fuel is pushed out through the fuel outlet port. Yonetsu, paragraph [0063].

Applicants respectfully submit that that a combination of Shulsinger and the Yonetsu references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 12, because Shulsinger and Yonetsu would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of any of Claims 1 to 3, upon which Claim 12 depends. As noted above, recitations of Claim 1, on which Claim 2 depends include, inter alia, a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom; and the recitations of Claim 3 include, inter alia, a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port by the action of the back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom. Shulsinger discloses that the piston contacts the valve, not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet, as recited in Claim 1, on which Claim 2 depends; and not that a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port, as recited in Claim 3. Applicants respectfully submit that Yonetsu would not have remedied the deficiencies of Shulsinger, because Yonetsu does not disclose or render obvious a

face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, as recited in Claim 1 on which Claim 2 depends. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Yonetsu would not have remedied the deficiencies of Shulsinger, because Yonetsu does not disclose or render obvious a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port by the action of the back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, as recited in Claim 3. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that any of Claims 1 to 3 would not have been obvious over a combination of Shulsinger and Yonetsu.

As noted above, Claim 12 depends on any of Claims 1 to 3. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 12 would not have been obvious over a combination of Shulsinger and the Yonetsu, and the additional recitations of Claim 12 would not have been obvious over a combination of Shulsinger and Yonetsu.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of new Claim 13, including, inter alia, a fuel container according to claim 1, wherein a stopper that prevents a contact

between the partition wall member and a bottom wall member of the container is formed on the bottom wall member, as recited in Claim 13. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 1 wherein a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, for the reasons noted above. Claim 13 depends on Claim 1. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious Claim 13, and the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the additional recitations of Claim 13.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of new Claim 14, including, inter alia, a fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 1, wherein the compressed gas chamber surrounds the liquid fuel container. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 1 wherein a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, for the reasons noted above. Claim 14 depends on Claim 1. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends.

Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious Claim 14, and the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the additional recitations of Claim 14.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of new Claim 15, including, inter alia, a fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 1, wherein the compressed gas chamber and the liquid fuel container are arranged on the same axis of thereof. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 1 wherein a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, for the reasons noted above. Claim 15 depends on Claim 1. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious Claim 15, and the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the additional recitations of Claim 15.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of new Claim 16, including, inter alia, a fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 1, wherein the valve is fitted in a

connection port formed in the outlet of the liquid fuel chamber, the valve having a spacer disposed on a peripheral wall of a bottom of the connection port, a spring supported within the spacer, a gasket disposed over the spacer, a hollow valve stem having a communication hole, the valve stem being inserted within the gasket, a fixing member engaged with an inner wall of the connection port and configured to urge the valve stem against the spring to allow communication between an liquid fuel chamber and the fuel cell. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 1, on which Claim 16 depends, including, inter alia, a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, for the reasons noted above. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious Claim 16, and the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the additional recitations of Claim 16.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of new Claim 17, including, inter alia, a fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 1, wherein an outer periphery of the partition wall member is in airtight contact with an inner wall of the space, and an entire surface of the face of the partition wall is configured to conform against an entire surface of the end face of the space adjacent the outlet, for the reasons noted

above. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 1, on which Claim 17 depends, including, inter alia, a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, for the reasons noted above. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious Claim 17, and the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the additional recitations of Claim 17.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of new Claim 18, including, inter alia, a fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 17, wherein the liquid fuel chamber is filled with the liquid fuel. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 1, on which Claim 17 depends, including, inter alia, a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, for the reasons noted above. As noted above, Claim 18 depends on Claim 17, which depends on Claim 1. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the

additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious Claim 18, and the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the additional recitations of Claim 18.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of new Claim 19, including, inter alia, a fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 1, wherein the liquid fuel chamber is filled with the liquid fuel. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 1, including, inter alia, a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the space adjacent the outlet is configured to come into contact with the end face of the space adjacent the outlet by the action of back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, for the reasons noted above. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious Claim 19, and the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the additional recitations of Claim 19.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of new Claim 20, including, inter alia, a fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 3, wherein an outer periphery of the partition wall member is in airtight contact with an inner wall of the liquid fuel

chamber of the container body, and an entire surface of the face of the partition wall is configured to conform against an entire surface of the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port, for the reasons noted above. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 3, on which Claim 20 depends, including, inter alia, a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port by the action of the back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, for the reasons noted above. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious Claim 20, and the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the additional recitations of Claim 20.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of new Claim 21, including, inter alia, a fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 20, wherein the liquid fuel chamber is filled with the liquid fuel. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 3, on which Claim 20 depends, including, inter alia, a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel

chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port by the action of the back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, for the reasons noted above. As noted above, Claim 21 depends on Claim 20, which depends on Claim 3. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious Claim 21, and the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the additional recitations of Claim 21.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of new Claim 22, including, inter alia, a fuel container for a fuel cell according to claim 3, wherein the liquid fuel chamber is filled with the liquid fuel. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the recitations of Claim 3, including, inter alia, a face of the partition wall member opposing an end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port is configured to come into contact with the end face of the liquid fuel chamber of the container body adjacent the connection port by the action of the back pressure applied by the compression gas so that the fuel in the fuel container is fully discharged therefrom, for the reasons noted above. A dependent claim refers back to and incorporates the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Moreover, the additional recitations of a dependent claim must be read as a whole with the recitations of the claim on which it depends. Therefore, for the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious Claim 22,

and the applied references would not have disclosed or rendered obvious the additional recitations of Claim 22.

In view of the foregoing comments and amendments, reconsideration and allowance of all claims presently in the application are respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the Deposit Account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Docket No. 520.46387X00) and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

By /Alan E. Schiavelli/
Alan E. Schiavelli
Registration No. 32,087

AES/GNT/kr
1300 N. Seventeenth Street
Suite 1800
Arlington, Virginia 22209
Tel: 703-312-6600
Fax: 703-312-6666